



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/840,083	05/06/2004	Michael Borella	82440	7848

22242 7590 03/03/2008
FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY
120 SOUTH LA SALLE STREET
SUITE 1600
CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406

EXAMINER

NICKERSON, JEFFREY L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/03/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/840,083

Applicant(s) **MN**

BORELLA ET AL.

Examiner

JEFFREY NICKERSON

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 May 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07 October 2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Application No. 10/840,083 filed on 06 May 2004. The restriction election presented on 14 February 2008, which elected group I (claims 1-28, 29-42, and 43-49), is hereby acknowledged. Claims 1-49 have been examined.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 66a and 66d (Applicant submitted specification: [0044]).

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: 66 (Figure 6).

4. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2142

CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 12-13, 17, 21, are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) because of the following informalities: lack of antecedent basis.

Regarding claim 12, this claim recites the limitation "the push-to-talk clients" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of further examination this will be considered as "the clients, wherein the clients are push-to-talk clients,..." Correction is required.

Regarding claim 13, this claim recites the limitation "the given one of the push-to-talk clients" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of further examination this will be considered without change, but dependent on the examiner consideration with regard to claim 12. Correction is required.

Regarding claim 17, this claim recites the limitation "the plurality of push-to-talk clients" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For

Art Unit: 2142

purposes of further examination this will be considered as "the plurality of clients, wherein the clients are push-to-talk clients,..." Correction is required.

Regarding claim 21, this claim recites the limitation "of push-to-talk clients" in line 2.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of further examination this will be considered as "of clients, wherein the clients are push-to-talk clients,..." Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1, 16, 24-26, 29, 37-38, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gallant (US 2002/0165969 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Gallant teaches a system to facilitate SIP proxy-based support routing as regards communications for at least a given region (Gallant: [0031]), comprising:

at least one SIP proxy dedicated, at least in part, to supporting routing of communications (Gallant: [0031]) for a plurality of clients in the given region (Gallant:

Art Unit: 2142

abstract, figure 2), wherein at least some of the plurality of clients have a plurality of differing user identifiers (Gallant: abstract, Figure 3; See also [0072] and [0073]), and wherein, for at least one of the plurality of clients, at least two of the plurality of differing user identifiers each corresponds to a same first communication service (Gallant: [0054] specifies aliases can be used for the same service, such as private phone lines)

at least one memory operably coupled to the at least one SIP proxy (Gallant: [0089]).

Regarding claim 16, Gallant teaches wherein the at least one SIP proxy further supports presence service (Gallant: Figure 2, item 240; See also [0066]).

Regarding claim 24, Gallant teaches wherein the at least one SIP proxy further comprises routing means for making routing decisions for SIP messages as are provided thereto (Gallant: abstract and [0031]).

Regarding claim 25, Gallant teaches wherein the routing means are further for facilitating routing decisions in conjunction with a directory server (location server) (Gallant: [0015] specifies lookup table; See also [0066]).

Regarding claim 26, Gallant teaches wherein the routing means are further for making the routing decisions for all SIP messages as are provided thereto (Gallant: abstract and [0031]).

Art Unit: 2142

Regarding claim 29, this method claim comprises limitations corresponding to that of claim 1 and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Regarding claim 37, Gallant teaches further comprising:

Upon receiving a communication from a first one of the plurality of clients, automatically authenticating the first one of the plurality of clients via the at least one SIP proxy (Gallant: [0014] and [0063])

Regarding claim 38, Gallant teaches further comprising:

automatically authenticating the first one of the plurality of clients via the at least one SIP proxy using an authentication server (location server) (Gallant: [0063]).

Regarding claim 42, Gallant teaches further comprising:

upon receiving an SIP communication from a first one of the plurality of clients, automatically publishing presence information regarding the first one of the plurality of clients (Gallant: [0066]-[0068]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2142

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 4, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallant (US 2002/0165969 A1), and further in view of Kallio et al (US 2004/0190498 A1).

Regarding claim 4, Gallant teaches the use of multiple identifiers and implies the use of both SIP and telecommunication identifiers (Gallant: Figure 3, items 304 and below 302). He does not explicitly state that the differing identifiers have a SIP URI format and a TEL URI format.

Kallio, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein the differing identifiers are a standard SIP URI and a TEL URI (Kallio: [0058]; See also Figure 7)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Kallio for using SIP and TEL URIs. The teachings of Kallio, when implemented in the Gallant system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to use multiple different standardized URIs. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Kallio in the Gallant system because TEL URIs and SIP URIs have been standardized and are compatible across industry networks.

Art Unit: 2142

Regarding claim 30, this method claim comprises limitations corresponding to those in claim 4 and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Regarding claim 31, this method claim comprises limitations corresponding to those in claim 4 and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

10. Claims 3, 5, 11-14, 17-23, 27, 34-36, 39-41, and 43-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallant (US 2002/0165969 A1), and further in view of Denman et al (US 7,170,863 B1).

Regarding claim 3, Gallant teaches wherein the at least two of the plurality of differing users identifiers correspond to a same communication service (Gallant: [0054] specifies aliases can be used for the same service, such as private phone lines), but Gallant does not teach wherein the communication service is a push-to-talk communication service.

Denman, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein the service is a push-to-talk (PTT) service (Denman: abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Denman for providing support for push-to-talk services. The teachings of Denman, when implemented in the Gallant system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to alias user identifiers in a network that supports push-to-talk communications. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to

Art Unit: 2142

utilize the teachings of Denman in the Gallant system in order to provide direct digital radio communication features to customers.

Regarding claim 5, the Gallant/Denman system teaches wherein the at least one SIP proxy operably couples to a PTT server (Denman: Figure 2, items 16 and 34).

Regarding claim 11, the Gallant/Denman system teaches wherein the at least one SIP proxy supports SIP compression (Denman: col 13, lines 47-50).

Regarding claim 12, the Gallant/Denman system teaches wherein the at least one SIP proxy supports SIP compression to thereby improve airlink utilization as between a given one of the clients, wherein the clients are PTT clients, and the at least one SIP proxy (Denman: col 13, lines 47-50).

Regarding claim 13, the Gallant/Denman system teaches wherein the at least one SIP proxy comprises a first hop SIP proxy with respect to the given one of the PTT clients (Denman: Figure 2, item 20 into item 16; Figure 4 further depicts no intermediary SIP proxies).

Regarding claim 14, the Gallant/Denman system teaches wherein the at least one SIP proxy supports PTT communications for roaming PTT clients in the given region (Denman: Figure 3, item 54; col 12, lines 60-63)

Art Unit: 2142

Regarding claim 17, the Gallant/Denman system teaches wherein the at least one SIP proxy further supports presence service for at least some of the clients, wherein the clients are PTT clients, within the given region (Denman: Figure 2, item 38; col 9, lines 39-46)

Regarding claim 18, the Gallant/Denman system teaches wherein the given region comprises a plurality of PTT service domains each having a corresponding URI domain name (Denman: col 16, lines 20-28 specify that the user can be determined if it is "at home" by looking at the domain name, which provides that varying regions have varying domain names; See also col 22, lines 37-67).

Regarding claim 19, the Gallant/Denman system teaches wherein the given region comprises a PTT service domain of a PTT service having a plurality of PTT service domains each having a corresponding URI domain name (Denman: col 16, lines 20-28 specify that the user can be determined if it is "at home" by looking at the domain name, which provides that varying regions have varying domain names; See also col 22, lines 37-67).

Regarding claim 20, the Gallant/Denman system teaches wherein the user IDs for the plurality of clients have at least one of a domain name and a sub-domain name that is distinct from any domain name and sub-domain name, respectively, as is assigned to

Art Unit: 2142

any network component in the system (Denman: col 16, lines 40-45 specify the mobile subscribers register an IP address as a contact for their username@domain, which would be distinct from all other users).

Regarding claim 21, the Gallant/Denman system teaches wherein the at least one SIP proxy further comprises authentication and registration means for facilitating authentication of clients, wherein the clients are PTT clients. (Denman: abstract, Figure 2, items 36 and 38; See also col 13, lines 25-30 for AAA server description).

Regarding claim 22, the Gallant/Denman system teaches wherein the authentication and registration means are further for serving as a registrar for mobile clients (Gallant: [0009] specifies multiple client terminals, such as mobile phones; Denman: abstract).

Regarding claim 23, the Gallant/Denman system teaches wherein the authentication and registration means are further for accommodating a PTT client that presents either of at least two different available-to-the-client client URIs (Gallant: abstract, [0072]-[0073] for multiple differing user IDs; Denman: abstract for PTT)

Regarding claim 27, the Gallant/Denman system teaches wherein the at least one SIP proxy further comprises compression means for compressing and decompressing SIP traffic to and from a corresponding one of the PTT clients (Denman: Figure 2, items 16 to 20; col 13, lines 47-50 specify compression between MS and proxy server; col 15,

Art Unit: 2142

lines 28-37 specify uplink and downlink compression and decompression of SIP messages)

Regarding claim 34, this method claim comprises limitations corresponding to those in claim 3 and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Regarding claim 35, this method claim comprises limitations corresponding to those in claim 3 and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable, and wherein the communication is wireless (Denman: abstract).

Regarding claim 36, this method claim comprises limitations corresponding to those in claim 3 and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable, and wherein the communication is wired (Gallant: [0007]-[0009] specify Ethernet and traditional phones; [0004] specifies PBXs).

Regarding claim 39, the Gallant/Denman system teaches further comprising:

upon receiving a SIP communication from a first one of the plurality of clients, automatically decompressing the SIP communication (Denman: Figure 2, items 16 to 20; col 13, lines 47-50 specify compression between MS and proxy server; col 15, lines 28-37 specify uplink and downlink compression and decompression of SIP messages).

Regarding claim 40, the Gallant/Denman system teaches further comprising:

Art Unit: 2142

automatically compressing a SIP communication to provide a compressed SIP communication intended for receipt by at least one of the plurality of clients (Denman: Figure 2, items 16 to 20; col 13, lines 47-50 specify compression between MS and proxy server; col 15, lines 28-37 specify uplink and downlink compression and decompression of SIP messages).

Regarding claim 41, this method claim comprises limitations corresponding to those in claim 40 and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable, and wherein the communication is wireless (Denman: abstract).

Regarding claim 43, the Gallant/Denman system teaches a SIP proxy comprising:

- a SIP proxy engine (Denman: fig 2, item 16; col 1, lines 34-53);

- a memory operably coupled to the proxy engine (Denman: claim 11; See also Figure 2, item 40);

- a PTT server interface to facilitate operably coupling the SIP proxy engine to a PTT server (Denman: Figure 2, item 16 to item 34)

- wherein the SIP proxy engine has at least a first mode of operation wherein the SIP proxy engine will facilitate a PTT communication for a PTT client that communicates a SIP message to the SIP proxy containing either of two different client identifiers as are available to that PTT client (Denman: abstract for PTT communications; See also Figure 2 for proxy setup; Gallant: Figure 3 has multiple ID mappings; [0072]-[0073] describes identity aliasing with multiple IDs)

Art Unit: 2142

Regarding claim 44, this SIP proxy claim comprises limitations corresponding to those in claim 27 and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Regarding claim 45, this SIP proxy claim comprises limitations corresponding to those in claim 27 and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Regarding claim 46, this SIP proxy claim comprises limitations corresponding to those in claim 21 and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable, and wherein the client is a PTT client (Denman: abstract).

Regarding claim 47, this SIP proxy claim comprises limitations corresponding to those in claim 24 and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable, and wherein the client is a PTT client (Denman: abstract).

Regarding claim 48, this SIP proxy claim comprises limitations corresponding to those in claim 42 and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable, and wherein the client is a PTT client (Denman: abstract).

Regarding claim 49, this SIP proxy claim comprises limitations corresponding to those in claim 14 and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Art Unit: 2142

11. Claims 2, 6-7, and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallant (US 2002/0165969 A1), and further in view of Hedin et al (US 2004/0073685 A1).

Regarding claim 2, Gallant teaches the use of a SIP proxy (Gallant: [0031]). Gallant does not teach wherein the at least one proxy comprises at least two proxies.

Hedin, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein the at least one proxy comprises at least two proxies (Hedin: Figure 10, items 10-1 and 10-2; See also [0095])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Hedin for using multiple proxy servers. The teachings of Hedin, when implemented in the Gallant system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to manage separate networks with different proxies and translate aliases between the networks. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Hedin in the Gallant system in order to allow multiple subnets be managed by their own proxy and be able to communicate with one another.

Regarding claim 6, this system claim comprises limitations corresponding to those in claim 1 and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable, and wherein the an additional SIP proxy handles a second region of clients (Hedin: Figure 10, item 10-2 and UMTS network; See also [0095]).

Art Unit: 2142

Regarding claim 7, the Gallant/Hedin system teaches wherein the at least one SIP proxy as is dedicated to the region is operably coupled to the at least one additional SIP proxy as is dedicated to the second region (Hedin: Figure 10, item 10-1 into item 10-2).

Regarding claim 9, the Gallant/Hedin system teaches wherein a wireless coverage area as corresponds to the region does not overlap with any part of a wireless coverage area as corresponds to the second region (Hedin: Figure 10, GSM network does not overlap with UMTS network).

Regarding claim 10, this system claim comprises limitations corresponding to those in claim 1 and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable, and wherein the an additional SIP proxy handles an additional region of clients (Hedin: Figure 10, item 10-2 and UMTS network; See also [0095]).

Examiner Note: Attempting to distinguish between subsequent incremental networks as "third", etc, when the system itself is identical is not effective and not given patentable weight, as a plurality of network interconnects covers any incrementally claimed network interconnects. Theoretically, if given patentable weight, one could merely restate the entire system for one interconnected network more than the prior art and it would be patentable.

Art Unit: 2142

12. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallant (US 2002/0165969 A1) and further in view of Hedin et al (US 2004/0073685 A1), and in further view of Denman et al (US 7,170,863 B1).

Regarding claim 15, the Gallant/Hedin system teaches wherein the at least one SIP proxy supports inter-region styled communications as between clients that are located in different regions (Hedin: [0095]; See also Figure 10, item 46 to item 42).

The Gallant/Hedin system does not teach PTT communication.

Denman, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein the communication is PTT communication.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Denman for providing support for push-to-talk services. The teachings of Denman, when implemented in the Gallant/Hedin system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to alias user identifiers in interconnected networks that support push-to-talk communications. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Denman in the Gallant/Hedin system in order to provide direct digital radio communication features to customers.

13. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallant (US 2002/0165969 A1) and Hedin et al (US 2004/0073685 A1), and with Official Notice.

Art Unit: 2142

Regarding claim 8, the Gallant/Hedin system teaches a plurality of wireless coverage network regions. (Hedin: Figure 10).

The Gallant/Hedin system does not explicitly teach that the coverage area of the wireless networks could overlap. An official notice is taken that such use of overlapping the coverage area of wireless networks is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize any known methods of providing wireless network coverage because it would have enabled practicing the Gallant/Hedin system.

14. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallant (US 2002/0165969 A1), and further in view of Zmolek (US 2003/0154293 A1).

Regarding claim 28, Gallant teaches supporting presence within the system (Gallant: Figure 2, item 240; See also [0066]). Gallant does not teach the use of SIP/SIMPLE messages to provide presence information.

Zmolek, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein presence information is provided with SIMPLE (Zmolek: [0007]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Zmolek for using SIMPLE messages. The teachings of Zmolek, when implemented in the Gallant system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to pass presence information using a standardized format. One

Art Unit: 2142

of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Zmolek in the Gallant system in order to use an IETF defined standard for presence information.

15. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallant (US 2002/0165969 A1), and further in view of Grabelsky et al (US2004/0249951 A1).

Regarding claim 32, Gallant teaches the use of providing a SIP proxy (Gallant: [0031]), but Gallant does not teach providing the SIP proxy with a system name having a domain different than the domain name assigned to any of the plurality of clients.

Grabelsky, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein the SIP proxy's domain name is different than any of the plurality of clients (Grabelsky: Table above [0040] depicts that the SIP proxy server's domain, i.e. the VIA field domain pc33.atlanta.com, is different than the client's domain that it is servicing, i.e. the FROM field domain atlanta.com).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Grabelsky for using different domain names. The teachings of Grabelsky, when implemented in the Gallant system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to identify the subdomain of the telecommunication network's servicing components when communicating to aliased clients. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Grabelsky in the Gallant system in order to easily differentiate between management devices and clients.

Art Unit: 2142

16. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallant (US 2002/0165969 A1) and Hedin et al (US 2004/0073685 A1), and further in view of Gupta (US 2005/0197101 A1).

Regarding claim 33, the Gallant/Hedin system teaches the use of providing multiple SIP proxies to differing regions (Gallant: [0031]; Hedin: Figure 10, items 10-1 and 10-2), but the Gallant/Hedin does not teach providing assigning the proxies to different PTT domains.

Gupta, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches assigning different PTT domains (Gupta: [0030]-[0032]; Figure 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Gupta for using different domain names for PTT domains. The teachings of Gupta, when implemented in the Gallant/Hedin system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to break up the management of PTT domains by proxy server while aliasing PTT clients. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Gupta in the Gallant/Hedin system in order to easily differentiate between PTT domains handled by their respective proxy.

Art Unit: 2142

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEFFREY NICKERSON whose telephone number is (571)270-3631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 8:30-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 2142



ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER